Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/597,537	HENDRIKS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jordan M. Schwartz	2873
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Jordan M. Schwartz</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Dicran Halajian</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>14 September 2009</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 10-11, 19-20		
Prior art documents discussed: Kuiper'734		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a writton record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Jordan M. Schwartz/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2873	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was the examiner's contention that the figure 8 embodiment of Kuiper'734 still anticipated claims 10 and 12-19. It was therefore agreed to incorporate the language of claim 11 into both independent claims 10 and 19 to read over this reference. It was further agreed to then cancel claim 11. The aforementioned was done as per the examiner's amendment. Applicant's representative also requested that allowable claim 20 be placed in independent form which the examiner also did by the examiner's amendment. The other minor changes to claims 10, 19 and 20 as set forth in the examiner's amendment were also agreed upon to provide additional clarity